

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-14, 19-22, and 25-28 were pending in this application. Claims 6, 15-18, and 23-24 were previously withdrawn from consideration. Claims 2-9, 11-13, 15-17, 22-24, and 27 have now been canceled. Hence, claims 1, 10, 14, 18-21, 25-26, and 28 remain pending in this application.

Independent claim 1 was amended to incorporate the subject matter of canceled claims 3 and 5.

Dependent claims 10 and 18 were amended to change their dependencies from canceled dependent claim 5 to independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests that dependent claim 18 (previously withdrawn by Applicant) and dependent claim 20 (withdrawn by the Examiner in the Office Action) be considered in light of the above amendments.

Claims 1, 10, 14, 18-21, and 25 were also amended to correct grammatical and/or antecedent basis errors.

Applicant respectfully submits no new matter was added as a result of the above amendments.

Objection to the Claims

The Examiner objects to claims 1-5, 7-14, 19-22, 25-26, and 28 because of the informalities noted in the Office Action. Applicant believes the informalities have now been corrected and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

Rejection of the Claims

The Examiner rejects claims 2-5, 8-10, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner also rejects claims 1-3, 19, 21-22, 25, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP Patent Publication No. 61-027517 (Fujimura) in view of US patent No. 4,883,340 (Dominguez).

To the extent the above rejections may be applied to the claims as amended, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges with thanks the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 4-5 and 7-14. These claims were rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under §112.

Arguments in Support of the Claims

Concerning the indefiniteness rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the Examiner states that the term “parallel four-connecting-rod mechanism” is not clear. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The term “parallel four-connecting-rod mechanism” is a standard term in the field of mechanics and refers to an arrangement where four connecting rods are connected together to substantially form a parallelogram structure. However, for the sake of clarity, Applicant has amended the term “parallel four-connecting-rod mechanism” in claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom to read “parallel connecting-rod mechanism” and has defined the specific structure of the parallel connecting-rod mechanism in accordance with the specification and drawings.

The Examiner also states that “the drawings and specification do not support the reflectors being respectively fixed on all parallel connecting rods.” Applicant has incorporated the above limitation into independent claim 1 and has amended the claim to recite that “each of the planar reflectors being fixed on at least one pivoting rod.” Applicant respectfully submits that this limitation, as amended, is now fully supported by the drawings and specification because the planar reflector can adjust its altitudinal angle with the variations of the angle of the parallel connecting-rod mechanism as long as the planar reflector is fixed on one pivoting rod. Furthermore, it would be well known by those skilled in the art to fix the planar reflector on two

or more pivoting rods in order to increase the fixation intensity. Fig. 1, for example, shows a specific implementation where each of the planar reflectors is fixed on two pivoting rods 44.

Applicant respectfully submits that any remaining rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, have been resolved by the claim amendments made herein. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Concerning the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimura and Dominguez, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the subject matter of dependent claim 5, which claim was indicated to be allowable by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection against independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

As for dependent claims 10, 14, 18-21, 25-26, and 28, although they may recite independently allowable subject matter, these claims depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of any remaining rejection against dependent claims 10, 14, 18-21, 25-26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issuance.

Dated: November 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By /Daniel G. Nguyen/

Daniel G. Nguyen

Registration No.: 42,933

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

5 Houston Center

1401 McKinney, Suite 2600

Houston, Texas 77010

(713) 951-3300

Attorneys For Applicant